

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sekiya et al. (US 4,990,939).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sekiya et al. (US 4,990,939). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 12 recite an ink jet recording head and an ink jet recording apparatus, respectively, including, in part, a plurality of heater resistor portions such that “each heater resistor portion being formed by a bubbled-ink forming area for heating and vaporizing ink and by extended portions which are connected to opposite ends, in the first direction, of the bubbled-ink forming area.” The Office Action alleges that the Sekiya et al. teaches (col. 6, lines 54-67) features of heater resistor portions, as recited by independent claims 1 and 12. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Sekiya et al. is completely silent with regard to heater resistor portions that include “extended portions which are connected to opposite ends, in the first direction, of the bubbled-ink forming area.” Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Sekiya et al., at col. 6, lines 54-67, discloses nothing regarding extended portions that are connected to opposite ends along the first direction. In FIGs. 5, 6B, and 6C, the heater 11 extends in a direction perpendicular to a widthwise direction (i.e., the first direction) and has no extended portions at both ends in the widthwise direction. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Sekiya et al. fails to teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1 and 12, and hence dependent claims 2-11.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Sekiya et al. neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 12, and hence dependent claims 2-11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: January 18, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000